



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It must make the structure of society known to its graduates. They must understand political institutions; they must be familiar with literature; at least one modern language must be theirs. Some knowledge of the principles of law must be theirs. A full acquaintance with the just limits of the Law of Libel must be theirs. But when this is all done, unless the newspaper man can write, he is as a man dumb among the blind, without even a sign by which he can make himself known.

The practical result of a grapple with this problem in two years of academic work and one-half year before of anxious preparation and organization is that I speak here looking to the special relation of liberal studies to the work and training of newspaper men as well as to the wider influence of this sphere of education. Since I spoke twenty years ago, in the midst of a great conflict in American education over liberal and practical studies, the battle has been fought and lost, so far as liberal studies are concerned in the wide arena of training. Substantially all Colleges then required liberal studies as a requisite for a degree. Substantially all Colleges now accept for their degrees of many sorts, and even for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, practical studies which have their liberal side, but are not included under the generic term of 'liberal studies'. Once all studies, at the opening of the Renaissance, were alike liberal and practical. The learning of the world, its knowledge, its science, its inspiration, sacred and secular, were all in Greek or in Latin. Under the stimulus of their literature and their record, discovery began. As science grew, it gained a larger and larger empire in the field of education. The old learning ceased to contain the science of the world. Broadly speaking, the old learning came to stand for the inspiration of humanity in the greater monuments of letters and the new for the expanding knowledge of humanity in its environing conditions.

The work of the newspaper necessarily deals with these environing conditions. The newspaper man must know them or he is lost, and his work is of no effect. Society has become a vast complex, in which it is no longer possible to depend upon the individual knowledge gained through association and action with men, in the small cities of a sparsely settled country. The journalist instead must see the world as it is, and know yesterday, that yesterday of which so little is written in history, so that he can see the forces which affect to-morrow.

The School of Journalism, of which I have the honor to be the Director, has a four years' course. This is all too short for the knowledge necessary to the journalist. The difficulty under which the School daily labors is the task of weaving into the acquisition of knowledge the technical capacity to express this knowledge effectively. Unless the journalist can do this, all he has learned is ore in the hill. If he has learned to do this, the ore has been forged into a sword for the battle of humanity and for leadership of society. The principal difficulty which faces the School in the discharge of this task is that its students who come from the High School or who enter on advanced standing from other Colleges are without either the training or the inspiration which awakens in a man the capacity to write, by making him familiar with the monuments of the past, whether in his own tongue or in the classical languages. In the High School and the College it is alike true, that the student has been steadily acquiring all the various forms of the new learning and he has had little which gives him either the conception of style or the practical skill in the use of language which will make the written word in his hands inspiring, convincing or illuminating.

The 'English' which those who have had four years of training in the High School write is lamentable.

Men who have had one, two, three and sometimes four years in our Colleges are without knowledge of the first principles by which the writer must be guided. They understand less how a fact must be recorded, an opinion expressed, an argument made convincing, or an event touched with imagination than those who have been through the drill of the city-room and the news-desk. These are the practical results which accompany the great change in our education in the last forty years, which has supplanted the old learning by the new.

Fortunately, while the study of Latin has greatly decreased in our Colleges as compared with twenty to forty years ago, and Greek, save here and there, is taken by so few that in one College of the first rank (Yale) it was not possible to award the Greek prizes, the study of Latin in our Secondary Schools has greatly increased. In 1890 a little more than one-third (34.69 per cent) studied Latin. In our public High Schools, for the past ten years, this number has reached 50 per cent. This army of High School students, reaching 550,000 in 1912, or, including public and private schools, 620,000, constitutes the largest array of youth studying an ancient tongue ever gathered under the national system of schools in any land. Such improvement as has come in the English written in our High Schools is, I believe, due to this cause. It is at all events the experience of the School of Journalism that those who have a classical education write better than those who are without it. The School urges in preparatory training the combination of Latin and a foreign language. It gives an opportunity to continue the Classics for two years. Unable to secure, owing to the present condition of the problem with which it deals, and the time which it has, more attention to the monuments of ancient tongues, it has added a course for the reading of Shakespeare, the King James version of the Bible, and the greater letters of English. Observation and experience have made it perfectly clear that the training of the writer rests on the imitation and inspiration of models of style as it does on the patient training of the teacher.

The students bursting in a surging tide last June the flood-gates of all our institutions, eightfold more numerous in our Secondary Schools, fourfold more numerous in our higher education than forty years ago, have a training in science, in modern languages, in all the fields of economic and social study so far superior to that of their predecessors that a comparison is scarcely possible, but they are without the precise sense of literary force, that reverent conscientiousness of the past, and that vision of wisdom correcting and inspiring the light of common day which was the possession of those who had studied the old curriculum of Greek, Latin and Mathematics.

REVIEW

Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Ilias.
By Carl Rothe. Paderborn: Ferdinand
Schoeningh (1914). Pp. x + 360. Mk. 5.40.

This book appeared in just a little over three years after its now famous companion volume, *Die Ilias als Dichtung*, by the same author (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4:134-135). What a mass of Homeric books has appeared in this short interval! Shewan, Allen, Lang, Leaf, Van Leeuwen, Spiess, Dachs, Belzner, Roemer, Roessner, Stuermer, Draheim, Drerup, Laurand, Champault, Ludwig, and many others have contributed telling arguments for Homeric unity. I

doubt if any other period so brief has seen so much or such valuable work completed.

When Professor Rothe composed his *Ilias als Dichtung* he spoke as one in a minority against which the verdict in high places had already been rendered; accordingly he devoted more space to defending his position than to advancing his own theories. In the present volume he speaks with the assurance of a man convinced that he is in the right and also confident that the unbiased world of scholars has accepted his views; accordingly he gives little heed to his former adversaries. The *Homer-Kritik* is in his view not only a lost cause but a discredited one as well; hence nearly all of his thought is given to the poetic worth and harmony of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

Professor Rothe regards the *Odyssey* as the creation of a single poet who had the conception of the entire poem in his mind when he began the composition of the first book. He not only shows how the poet placed the blocks in this structure, but also reveals the artist at work preparing them. Thus, e. g., when the poet makes Telemachus repeatedly in the earlier books voice the hope that the suitors may die unavenged, he is preparing the setting for their death and for the reconciliation which left their slayers unpunished. The oft-recurring mention of the sad condition of Laertes prepares for the joyful meeting near the end of the poem. The note struck in the first book, that the suitors are to be punished, sounds clearer in the next when it is foretold that they will all perish in a single day, and this note sounds continually louder and clearer until we feel that they are doomed and we are ready for their fate when it comes. The poet must show not only that the suitors are to die but also that they deserve death, and no reader can fail to see how well he succeeded in this. The contrast between Penelope and Clytaemestra, begun in the first book, becomes more distinct until it reaches its climax and conclusion in the words spoken by the shade of Agamemnon near the end of the poem. And even so little a point as the fact that the floor is cleared immediately after the slaying of the suitors in order that makers of mirth may have a place to dance in a later scene shows the same poetic economy.

Every important event is somehow foretold and we are always ready for the crisis when it comes. Accordingly, we know in advance that the hero will return, that he will escape the Sirens, Scylla, the wrath of Poseidon, that he will slay the suitors, will find his wife true, and will once more assert his power in Ithaca.

The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are the creations of a single poet, whose work is to be judged and edited by the same standards and methods as that of Sophocles, Goethe, or Shakespeare.

Tradition has named one poet and only one as the author of these poems. The belief of the Greeks themselves and the united voices of tradition must have great weight, which can be set aside by nothing but the most convincing proofs, and no such proofs have yet been found. Professor Seymour, in his *Life in The*

Homeric Age (page 13), has this sentence, "We are obliged to consider the Homeric poems as units", although he was of the opinion that the arguments from language had proofs of various strata which were lacking in the field he covered. However, all these proofs from vocabulary, syntax, abstracts, patronymics, law, and theology have broken down when used as arguments for diverse authorship. All these tests show such absolute unity that we must assign the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to a single period of culture. There is not a test of wide application for separating Homer into strata which has found general acceptance among the disintegrators themselves. Cauter said five years ago that the test furnished by abstract nouns could not be answered, and it could not, unless one looked at Homer, but no one would advance that argument now. This was the solid rock on which Van Leeuwen rested his doubts, but when he saw the theory was false he abandoned the position he had held for so many years, and Homeric unity has now no more ardent champion.

The evident unity of language, meter, culture, and ideas cannot escape the notice of the attentive reader. Compare any part of Homer with his most careful imitator and the difference is enormous.

While these things do not involve the necessity of a single author, they do demand the same age and the same general environment. However, these poems show many similar traits which are not found in any other poem ancient or modern, and these traits show such a definite poetic individuality that they can hardly have belonged to more than one poet.

In each poem the poet plunges at once into the center of the action and gives but a brief period to the compass of the poem. The action of each involves about fifty days, and in each most of these days go by in silence. Thus, Odysseus is twenty days in going from Calypso to the Phaeacians, while a like number of days pass silently by in the first book of the *Iliad*. The real events are thus limited to a very few days and show a most striking contrast with the long periods involved in the *Cyclic Poems*, the *Aeneid*, or *Paradise Lost*.

Each Homeric poem has the same retardation of the climax. We expect Odysseus to destroy the suitors as soon as he returns, but there is a constant delay; the fight with the beggar, the washing of Odysseus's feet, the story of his scar, and many similar scenes put off the catastrophe and hold the attention of the hearer. Thus, also, when Achilles comes on the field with his new armor, we expect an immediate struggle with Hector, but he must first meet Aeneas, Lycaon, the god of the river, and we have here the same delay, the same multiplicity of events, and the same suspense of the hearer.

Each poem creates many subordinate actors and events in order to relax the attention and to intensify by contrast the interest in scenes and actors of greatest importance. These scenes are so skilfully distributed that no two of great importance are put in immediate juxtaposition.

When a visitor comes into the presence of any important character he finds him busy in some typical pursuit. So, when visited in the Iliad, Helen is weaving, Paris is polishing his armor, Achilles is playing on his lyre, Hephaestus is busy at his forge; likewise in the Odyssey the suitors are busy with games, Nestor is celebrating a religious feast, Menelaus a marriage, Eumaeus is cutting leather for shoes, Dolius is repairing a fence, and even old Laertes is at work in his garden. Surely these little intimate human touches are not a part of the tradition but the free creation of the poet. How hidden and yet how delicate this agreement and how sure to be missed by the mere imitator or copyist!

The similes also are drawn from the same sphere and show the same love of animals, the same acute observation, the same limitation to the objective world, the world that one sees; each poem has one and only one simile drawn from the realm of the mind. The humorous twinkle which is seen in the comparison of Ajax with a lazy ass is to be seen again in the passage of the Odyssey which likens the restless activity of Odysseus to the motions of a sausage when kept over a hot fire. Andromache's picture of the sad fate of the widow and the orphan is seen again in the simile describing a man slain while defending his family.

Each poem relieves the too great tension of the hearer by indicating in advance the final outcome. We know that Achilles will throw off his anger, that Patroclus will be slain, and that Priam will come home in safety with the body of his son: thus also we are assured that Odysseus will return, that the suitors will perish, and that their death will not be avenged. Neither poem loses its interest from the fact that the fate of its hero is told in advance, but, like the Athenian drama, the merit of each poem lies in the manner of telling a story the outcome of which is already known. This shows that Euripides in his prologues had caught the true Homeric spirit. The fact that Homer felt it necessary to indicate in advance the course of the story is clear proof of the theory I have already advanced that the plot was not the gift of tradition but the independent creation of the poet himself.

The action of each poem is initiated by the gods. Athena gives Achilles the cue for his anger, and the same goddess puts in motion the action of the Odyssey. She also gives the Iliad a new start by encouraging Pandarus to break the oath, and she finds a setting for the story of the wanderings of Odysseus by her advice given to Nausicaa. In each poem the gods are burlesqued and in each they are used to make probable things in themselves most improbable.

In both poems the author describes superlative things, not by picturing them, but by showing the impression they make on others. Recall e. g. the effect of the sight of Helen on the Trojan elders, of the Palace of Menelaus on Telemachus and Peisistratus, and of the island of Calypso on Hermes.

The enumeration of these striking agreements might be prolonged, but it is sufficient to say that not one

single trait of genius, however minute, is found in either poem that does not appear in the other. The Odyssey everywhere presupposes the Iliad and bears the same poetic stamp, yet it never copies or imitates the Iliad.

The Odyssey is the work of the poet who wrote the Iliad, but he has learned much from experience: the faults of the Iliad are all avoided. These faults are two: crowding too much into single days and forgetting the hero during long stretches of the poem. In the Odyssey no day has a larger share in the action of the poem than might easily fall within a few hours, and everything in the poem, whether Odysseus is present or absent, points to him and increases his glory. The poet of the Iliad had more fire, more pathos, the poet of the Odyssey had greater mastery of poetic technique. A poet of youth and supreme genius could compose the Iliad; it took supreme genius and experience to make a poem out of the hard materials used in the Odyssey.

No one can read this book, *Odyssee als Dichtung*, without a deeper love and appreciation for Homer, an increased admiration and affection for Professor Rothe. This book is to be compared with no other than his own *Ilias als Dichtung* and it fairly eclipses the earlier production. No finer estimate of the genius of Homer has ever been written.

Just as I had finished the foregoing sentence a letter came telling me that Professor Rothe had fallen under his burden and that he is helpless from a paralytic stroke of unusual severity. Every lover of true merit will hope that he will soon recover to enjoy some of the honors which his unusual industry and ability have brought to him¹.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

Attention should have been called before this to the third edition of Professor F. F. Abbott's well known book, *A History and Description of Roman Political Institutions* (Ginn and Co., 1911). For this edition the two indices of the second edition were combined and much enlarged. In many cases, to the bibliographical material given at the end of the several chapters additions have been made, under the title *Supplementary Literature, 1901-1910*, of the titles, places of publication, etc., of the more important books on the subjects treated within the chapter that had appeared since Professor Abbott's book was first published. The result is a book at once readable and scholarly, and of prime importance in the field with which it deals. It may be heartily commended to all students of the political institutions of ancient Rome.

C. K.

¹ This was written in March last. Professor Rothe died June 15, at the early age of sixty-one. His death is a sad repetition of the fate of Professor Seymour and of Professor Roemer, each of whom died soon after the appearance of his great work on Homer, while Andrew Lang lived but a few months after the appearance of his *The World of Homer*.